

Page 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
PENDLETON DIVISION

OREGON FIREARMS FEDERATION, INC.,) Case No.
et al,) 2:22-cv-01815-IM
) (Lead Case)
Plaintiffs,) Case No.
) 3:22-cv-01859-IM
vs.) (Trailing Case)
) Case No.
TINA KOTEK, et al,) 3:22-cv-01862-IM
) (Trailing Case)
Defendants.) Case No.
) 3:22-cv-01869-IM
MARK FITZ, et al,) (Trailing Case)
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
vs.)
)
ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM, et al,)
) VIDEOCONFERENCE
Defendants.) DEPOSITION OF
) MICHAEL SIEGEL, M.D.
KATERINA B. EYRE, et al,)
) Taken in behalf
Plaintiffs,) of the Plaintiffs
)
vs.) March 17, 2023
)
ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM, et al,)
)
Defendants.)
) (All participants
DANIEL AZZOPARDI, et al,) appeared via
) videoconference.)
Plaintiffs,)
)
vs.)
) REPORTED BY:
ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM, et al,) Ashley L. Aronson
) Court Reporter
Defendants.)
)

Page 2

1 APPEARANCES:

2 For the Plaintiffs: MR. DANIEL J. NICHOLS
3 MR. CHRISTIAN CHO
4 Attorneys at Law
5 Juris Law, LLP
6 Three Centerpointe Drive
7 Suite 160
8 Lake Oswego, Oregon 97035
9 503-968-1475
10 dan@jurislawyer.com
11 christian@jurislawyer.com
12 (Via Zoom videoconference)

13 For the Defendants: MS. ERIN N. DAWSON
14 Attorney at Law
15 Markowitz Herbold, PC
16 1455 SW Broadway
17 Suite 1900
18 Portland, Oregon 97301
19 503-295-3085
20 erindawson@markowitzherbold.com
21 (Via Zoom videoconference)

22 Also Present: (None)

14 INDEX

15 EXAMINATION BY PAGE NO.
16 Mr. Nichols 3 - 98

17 EXHIBITS

18 No. 5 Curriculum Vitae 4
19 No. 6 Declaration 8
20 No. 7 Measure 114 62

Page 55

1 we used for classifying states as having a state-level
2 permit requirement is simply that the state requires a
3 permit, a state permit for the purchase and possession
4 of firearms.

5 Q. In your review of those -- of the literature
6 and your research, did you consider any of the
7 differences between those state permitting schemes and
8 how that would affect your opinion?

9 A. No, I'm not aware of any studies that have
10 looked at details about how the permitting scheme is
11 specifically done to try to differentiate, you know,
12 whether there are certain features of the permit
13 requirement that have differential effects.

14 Q. So do you have an opinion as to whether
15 particular details of a state permitting scheme are
16 more or less important, essential to your conclusion
17 about reduction of homicides and mass shootings?

18 A. I don't believe that they are that important
19 because the evidence is quite robust from multiple
20 studies that have looked at multiple states, and we're
21 not seeing discrepancies in the research so we're not
22 seeing, you know, in one state there was an effect and
23 another state there wasn't an effect.

24 Pretty much in every state that's been looked
25 at there has been an effect, so my opinion would be

Page 56

that there is no reason to believe that details about the permitting system are going to change my opinion about its effectiveness.

Q. So, for example, if different state law permitting schemes have different periods of time between how long it takes to apply for and obtain a permit, that in your opinion wouldn't change your conclusion in this case --

A. No.

O. -- is that right?

A. It wouldn't because, again, the evidence is so robust. The effect sizes are huge and the number of studies that were done in very different states that had very different details, none of that seems to make a difference. These studies are finding a large effect pretty much across the board.

Q. In your view in reviewing the permitting schemes for the purchase and possession of firearms, are there any elements of those schemes, and we can get into it more specifically, that are more or less important to you in your conclusion that they reduce homicides and mass shootings?

In other words, these schemes have a lot of different pieces to them. Is there any core components that to you make up the effective part of

Michael Siegel, M.D. - 3/17/2023

99

1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2 STATE OF OREGON)
3 COUNTY OF MULTNOMAH)

5 I, Ashley L. Aronson, a Notary Public in and
6 for the State of Oregon, certify that the
7 videoconference deposition of MICHAEL SIEGEL, MD,
8 occurred at the time and place set forth in the
9 caption hereof; that at said time and place I reported
10 in Stenotype all, the testimony adduced and other oral
11 proceedings had in the foregoing matter; that
12 thereafter my notes were reduced to typewriting under
13 my direction and the foregoing transcript, pages 1
14 through 98, both inclusive, contains a full, true and
15 correct record of all such testimony adduced and oral
16 proceedings had and of the whole thereof. Reading and
17 signing was not requested pursuant to FRCP Rule 30(e).

18 Witness my hand and Notarial seal at
19 Portland, Oregon, this 24th day of March, 2023.



21
22 ASHLEY L. ARONSON
23 Notary Public for the State of
24 Oregon, residing at Portland
Commission No. 1028978
25 My Commission Expires: 9/28/2026